Case 2:04-cv-74365-JCO-RSW ECF No. 1, PageID.1 Filed 11/09/04 Page 1 of 10

Recept # 51

514624

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

MARIA LOTOCZKY

Plaintiff.

04-74365

-v-

Case No. 04-Honorable

CK

CONNECTED VENTURES, LLC, a California corporation,

Defendant.

JOHN CORRETT O'MEARA

SAKIS & SAKIS, PLC

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Raymond S. Sakis

(P19843)

Dennis J. Grifka Jason R. Sakis

(P23048) (P59525)

Suite 123

By:

3250 West Big Beaver Road

Troy, Michigan 48084

248.649.1160

MAGISTRATE, ILIDGE P. STEVEN WHALEN

THERE IS NO OTHER PENDING OR RESOLVED CIVIL ACTION ARISING OUT OF THE TRANSACTION OR OCCUPRENCE ALLIGED IN THIS COMPLAINT.

NOV - 9 2004

CLERK'S OFFICE DETROIT PSG U.S. DISTRICT COURT

### COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

NOW COMES the plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, through her attorneys, Sakis & Sakis, PLC, and for her complaint against the defendant organization, Connected Ventures LLC, states as follows:

#### Parties / Jurisdiction / Venue

- 1. This lawsuit concerns the defendant organization's invasion of the plaintiff's privacy and the defendant organization's intentional infliction of emotional distress upon her.
- 2. The plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, resides in the City of Waterford, County of Oakland, State of Michigan.

- 3. Upon information and belief, the defendant organization, Connected Ventures, LLC, was organized under the laws of the State of California, with its principle place of business located at 1568 Oliver Avenue, Suite A, San Diego, California, 92109.
- 4. The defendant, Connected Ventures, LLC, is engaged in the business of hosting and managing an internet website which is known as CollegeHumor.com.
- 5. This internet website attracts more than 5 million visitors people worldwide, and displays 100 million pages on its website, each month.
- 6. The defendant organization derives a substantial profit from various organizations which pay for advertising space on the aforementioned website to advertise their products.
- 7. This Honorable Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter in dispute because the litigants are of diverse citizenship and jurisdiction is thus proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332. Furthermore, subject matter jurisdiction is proper because the amount in controversy exceeds Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000), exclusive of interest, costs, and attorney fees.
- 8. Venue is appropriate in this Honorable Court inasmuch as the defendant organization harmed and injured the plaintiff within this Honorable Court's jurisdiction, and also because the this is the federal jurisdiction where a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred. Namely, the plaintiff's privacy was invaded within this jurisdiction and she was also subjected to intentional infliction of emotional distress in this federal district.
- 9. General personal jurisdiction is proper within this instance because the defendant carries on continuous and systematic business within this federal district by virtue of reaching out to businesses of this state to secure advertising for its website.
- 10. Limited personal jurisdiction is also proper in this instance because the defendant caused the plaintiff's privacy to be invaded within this jurisdiction and because the plaintiff was subjected to intentional infliction of emotional distress in this jurisdiction.

#### **General Allegations**

- 11. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-10 as though fully set forth herein.
- 12. The internet website, CollegeHumor.com, owned and operated by the defendant, Connected Ventures, LLC, sells advertising space to advertisers around the world.
- 13. The advertisers pay the defendant organization a fee to place their advertisements on the aforementioned website, which is targeted for the 18-23 age group.
- 14. Plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, was employed by GMAC when she received e-mails linked to the website known as Collegel-lumor.com. Likewise, other employees of the company apparently received the same type of email, which was subsequent learned by the plaintiff.
- 15. This link was sent to her company e-mail address, which is monitored for content by supervisory personnel of GMAC.
- 16. On or about January 14, 2004, supervisory personnel for GMAC approached the plaintiff and asked her not to use the company e-mail system for personal use.
- 17. Plaintiff was unaware of the origination of the e-mail messages and had not been using the company email system for personal use.
- 18. The link contained in the emails were connected to the CollegeHumor.com website and directed the viewer to an intimate photograph of the plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, with a fabricated caption below the photograph.
- 19. Upon seeing the photograph of herself on the website, the plaintiff discovered that a computer disk containing her private photographs had been unlawfully taken from her home.
- 20. At no time did the plaintiff provide the defendant, or anyone else with permission for her private and intimate image to be displayed or dispersed in any manner.
- 21. At no time did the defendant contact the plaintiff for permission for her likeness to be displayed on the internet website.

- 22. Due to the posting of the plaintiff's personal photograph on the website, the plaintiff was constructively discharged from her position at GMAC.
- 23. The embarrassment and humiliation the plaintiff suffered from her colleagues' and supervisors' observance of the photograph caused the work environment at GMAC to be intolerable to the plaintiff.
- 24. The defendant's actions were committed with reckless indifference to the privacy rights of the plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky.
- 25. As a result of the defendant's reckless failure to receive permission to display and disperse the plaintiff's personal image/photograph over the internet, the plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, has sustained significant lost wages, severe emotional pain and suffering, shame, humiliation, damage to her reputation amongst professional colleagues and her community, costs, attorney fees, punitive damages, and all other damages available.

### Count I Invasion / Intrusion of Privacy

- 26. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-25 of her Complaint by reference, as though they were fully stated herein.
- 27. Plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, had a right to privacy in connection with her personal and intimate photographs.
- 28. Notwithstanding the plaintiff's right to privacy, her personal photographs were stolen from her residence and, without her knowledge and/or permission, were placed on the defendant's website accompanying advertisements for which the defendant derived a profit.
- The invasion of the plaintiff's privacy by the publication of her private photographs on the website was extremely objectionable and injurious to the plaintiff.
- 30. The publication of the plaintiff's photograph on the defendant's website without her knowledge and permission caused her extreme mental suffering, pain, and humiliation.

31. As a result of the defendant's reckless failure to receive permission to display and disperse the plaintiff's personal image/photograph over the internet, the plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, has sustained significant lost wages, severe emotional pain and suffering, shame, humiliation, damage to her reputation amongst professional colleagues and her community, costs, attorney fees, punitive damages, and all other damages available.

### Count II <u>Invasion of Privacy / Appropriation</u>

- 32. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-31 of her Complaint by reference, as though they were fully stated herein.
- 33. By using the plaintiff's photographs in connection with other paid advertisements to secure the viewer's attention, the defendant secured a pecuniary benefit.
- 34. The intimate photograph published on the defendant's internet website was that of the plaintiff, which displayed the plaintiff's first name for identification below the photograph.
- 35. By using the plaintiff's intimate photograph in connection with other advertisements, thereby bringing more attention to said advertisements, the defendant gained pecuniary benefit.
- 36. The aforementioned publication of the plaintiff's photograph by the defendant has invaded the plaintiff's privileges and protection of her personal feelings, and caused her substantial loss of earnings along with mental and physical injury.
- 37. As a result of the defendant's reckless failure to receive permission to display and disperse the plaintiff's personal image/photograph over the internet, the plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, has sustained significant lost wages, severe emotional pain and suffering, shame, humiliation, damage to her reputation amongst professional colleagues and her community, costs, attorney fees, punitive damages, and all other damages available.

### Count III Invasion of Privacy / Publication

- 38. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-37 of her Complaint by reference, as though they were fully stated herein.
- 39. The defendant organization knew, or should have known, that by publishing the intimate photographs of the plaintiff concerning her private life on its internet website without her knowledge or permission, such publication would be highly offensive and damaging to the plaintiff.
- 40. The defendant organization's publication of the plaintiff's intimate photographs concerning her private life, without her knowledge or permission, was not a legitimate concern to the general public.
- 41. The aforementioned publication of the plaintiff's intimate photographs without her knowledge or permission created unnecessary publicity, and was an unreasonable and serious interference with the plaintiff's interest in not having her affairs known to others.
- 42. Defendant's publication of the plaintiff's intimate images concerning her private life, without her knowledge or permission, by virtue of placing said photographs on its internet website, exposed the plaintiff to hundreds of thousands of viewers, thereby providing a widespread communication of said photographs to the general public as opposed to a limited group.
- 43. As a consequence of the defendant's publication of the plaintiff's intimate images, the plaintiff has suffered monetary loss, embarrassment, humiliation, and emotional distress.
- 44. As a result of the defendant's reckless failure to receive permission to display and disperse the plaintiff's personal image/photograph over the internet, the plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, has sustained significant lost wages, severe emotional pain and suffering, shame, humiliation, damage to her reputation amongst professional colleagues and her community, costs, attorney fees, punitive damages, and all other damages available.

# Count IV Invasion of Privacy; False Light

- 45. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-44 of her Complaint by reference, as though they were fully stated herein.
- 46. Defendant's publication of the plaintiff's intimate image concerning her private life on its website, without her knowledge or permission, thereby exposing the plaintiff's photograph to hundreds of thousands of viewers, caused the plaintiff significant publicity.
- 47. Defendant's publication of the plaintiff's intimate photographs on its website placed the plaintiff in a false light, in the public eye by portraying her as an immoral person.
  - 48. As a result, plaintiff has sustained monetary loss, humiliation, and severe mental pain.
- 49. As a result of the defendant's reckless failure to receive permission to display and disperse the plaintiff's personal image/photograph over the internet, the plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, has sustained significant lost wages, severe emotional pain and suffering, shame, humiliation, damage to her reputation amongst professional colleagues and her community, costs, attorney fees, punitive damages, and all other damages available.

## Count V Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

- 50. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-49 of her Complaint by reference, as though they were fully stated herein.
- 51. Defendant's publication of the plaintiff's intimate, private, photographs, without her knowledge or permission, constituted extreme and outrageous conduct.
- 52. Defendant's publication of the plaintiff's intimate, private, photographs on its website, without her knowledge or permission, was done intentionally or in outright, wanton, reckless disregard of the plaintiff's rights to privacy.

Case 2:04-cv-74365-JCO-RSW ECF No. 1, PageID.8 Filed 11/09/04 Page 8 of 10

53. Defendant's publication of the plaintiff's intimate, private, images, without her

knowledge or permission was prominently displayed on an e-mail message system which was

transmitted to her supervisors and co-workers at GMAC.

54. Employees of the plaintiff's employer, including the plaintiff were advised by the

management of GMAC not to use the e-mail system for anything but work purposes.

55. That, contrary to the company guidelines and rules, the private image was placed on

the company email system.

56. As a result, numerous employees and management viewed the picture.

57. Due to the posting and viewing of the plaintiff's photograph, she was constructively

discharged by her former employer, GMAC.

58. The placement of the intimate and private photograph on its website, without her

knowledge and permission, was the proximate cause of the plaintiff's constructive discharge.

59. As a result Plaintiff has sustained monetary loss, humiliation, and severe mental pain.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Maria Lotoczky, respectfully requests that the plaintiff be

awarded compensation in an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000),

exclusive of interest, costs, and attorney fees, for her past, present, and future non-pecuniary losses

resulting from the defendant organization's conduct, back pay and other lost wages and benefits lost,

punitive damages for the defendant's malicious and/or reckless conduct, costs, attorney fees, and

other relief as is reasonably necessary to compensate the plaintiff for the invasion of her privacy and

the intentional infliction of emotional distress upon her, all in amounts to be determined at trial.

Demand is hereby made for a trial by jury.

SAKIS & SAKIS, PLC

Attorneys for Plaintiff

DATED:

November 2, 2004

Jason R. Sakis (P59525)

Page 8 of 8

Case 2:04-	cv-74365-JCO-	RSW ECF	No.	1, PageID.9 Fi		age 9 of 10 Inema/RSu	
The JS-44 civil cover shee	t and the Information cor d by local rules of court	itained herein neithe . This form, approv	r repla red by	the Judicial Conference	SE: Oakland	74365 gs or other papers as required September 1974, is required	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANT	rs o	•	
Maria Lotoczky			\	Connected Ve 1568 Oliver A San Diego, Ca	nture: LC venue, Ste. A lifornia 92109	74365	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed  Oakland - M1  County of Residence of First Listed  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED						SE THE LOCATION OF THE	
(C) Attorney's (Firm Name	, Address, and Telephone	Number)		Attorneys (If Kno		TOMEARA	
Jason R. Sakis (P595		is, PLC		Unknown			
3250 West Big Beaver Rd., Stc. 123 Trov. Michigan 48084 - 248.649.1160  MAGISTRATE JUDGE R. STEVEN WHALEN							
11. BASIS OF JURIS			III. C			Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
1 U.S. Government .	3 Federal Question		(	(For Diversity Cases Only) PL/ Citizen of This State	DEF 1 Incorporated	and One Box for Defendant) PLA DEF or Principal Place 4 4 4 ss in This State	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	Diversity (Indicate Citize in Item 111)	enship of Parties	(	Citizen of Another	2 🕱 2 Incorporated of Busines	and Principal 5 5 s In Another State	
			(	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 3 Fdreign Natio	n	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	<del></del>						
CONTRACT  110 insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	RTS PERSONAL INJUI		FORFEITURE / PENALTY □ 610 Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY  422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES  400 State Reapportionment	
120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotlable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment and	☐ 31 0 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault Libel	☐ 362 Personal Inju  Med, Malpract ☐ 365 Personal InV  Product Lia ilii	ry- ice ry -	620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21: 861 630 Liquor Laws	423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 41 0 Antitrust☐ 430 Banks and Banking☐ 450 Commerce/ICC☐ 460 Deportation	
Enforcement of Judgment	And Slander	368 Asbestos Pers	onal C	□ 640 R.R. & Truck	PROPERTY RIGHTS	470 Racketeer Influenced &	
☐ 151 Medicare Act☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted☐ Student Loans☐	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine	Liability PERSONAL PROPE	RTY C	□ 650 Airline Regs. □ 660 Occupational Safety/Health	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations  810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Com modities/	
(Excl. Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lendir	ıg ├-	690 Other	SOCIAL SECURITY	Exchange  875 Customer Challenge 12 LISC 3410	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	350 Motor Vehicle 356 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 380 Other Persona Property Dama ☐ 385 Property Dama	age r	71 0 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 H IA (1 395ff)	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
195 Contract Product Liability	(x) 360 Other Personal Injury	Product Liabilit		Act □ 720 Labor/Mgmt.	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	□ 893 Environmental Matters	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION	SNC	Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt, Reporting	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	☐ 51 0 Motions to Vac Sentence	cate	& Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	Information Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/ Accommodations	Habeas Corpus: ☐ 530 General		790 Other Labor	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	Equal Access to Justice  950 Constitutionality of	
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	☐ 535 Death Penalty☐ 540 Mandamus & Otl☐ 550 Civil Rights☐ 555 Prison Condition		Litigation  791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Defendant)  B71 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609	State Statutes  State Statutes  890 Other Statutory Actions	
V. ORIGIN (PLAC	E AN "X" IN ONE BO	X ONLY)		Trans	ferred from	Appeal to	
Original 2 Removed from State Court Appellate Court Reopened another district another district another district another district another district another district (specify) 6 Multi district Litigation Magistrate							
V1. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)							
diversity of citizenship / 28 U.S.C. 1332							
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.	S IS A CLASS ACTIO P. 23	ON	\$DEMAND	CHECK YES on JURY DEMAND	ly if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See (S) instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER _		
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD							

### PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11

1.	Is this a case that has been previously dismissed?	D Yes
If yes, giv	ve the following information:	
Court:		
Case No.	:	
Judge: _		
2.	Other than stated above, are there any pending or prediscontinued or dismissed companion cases in this other court, including state court? (Companion case matters in which it appears substantially similar evid be offered or the same or related parties are present cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.	or any es are lence will and the
If yes, giv	ve the following information:	
Court: _		
Case No.	:	
Judge: _		
Notes:		